

BE CREMATED.

For Several Years the Prima Donna Expressed a Desire To Be Placed in the Retort After Death.

TO CARRY OUT HER WISHES.

Nothing as Yet Settled about the Rebuilding of the Fifth Avenue Theatre.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE HERALD.]
PITTSBURGH, Pa., Jan. 7, 1891.—It is expected that the body of Emma Abbott, who died in Salt Lake City on Monday, will be brought to Pittsburgh to be cremated.

Back in the 70's when the first bodies were cremated at the Lemoore Crematory in Washington, Pa., Miss Abbott happened to be in that town and was much interested in the new method of disposing of the dead.

Three years ago while in Pittsburgh Miss Abbott and Miss Annandale were preparing for an afternoon drive when some one suggested that they visit the Pittsburgh Crematory, which had just been completed.

"A new crematory here," exclaimed the Prima Donna. "How interesting! let us go and see it."

"How delightful, Lizzy!" she said, turning to Miss Annandale.

"Oh, no; it is not dreadful at all. I'm not afraid of the thought of death and I suppose I'll be burned away," she concluded, with a merry laugh.

And so it came about that the visit to the Lemoore Crematory was made. Picking up a tiny piece of bone Miss Abbott remarked as she left the place after an hour's stay—"I may have this as a sort of Talisman, a memento mori, you know, and besides it will remind me of my resolution."

"What resolution?" asked Miss Annandale.

"What resolution?" asked Miss Annandale.

"What resolution?" asked Miss Annandale.

Only a few weeks ago during her last appearance here Miss Abbott alluded to her desire to be cremated as a thing settled and understood.

The persons in charge of the crematory will give no information, but it is believed they have been instructed to have the retort in readiness.

WHAT HER BROTHER-IN-LAW SAYS.
[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE HERALD.]
CHICAGO, Jan. 7, 1891.—Miss Abbott's brother-in-law, Mr. A. B. Clark, has entered into correspondence with the managers of the Detroit Crematory, and if the wishes of Miss Abbott, as is believed will be expressed in her will, favor cremation, disposition will be made of the remains in accordance with her wishes. In the meantime they will be kept in the vault at Graceland, where they will be taken from the Central Music Hall, Friday afternoon, at two o'clock, after final funeral services.

AMBERG'S MEN TO GO TO JAIL.
JUDGE O'BRIEN IMPOSES PENALTIES FOR CONTEMPT IN PLAYING "DIE WILDE JAGD."
The production of the play "Die wilde Jagd" at the Amberg Theatre on the nights of October 17 and 18 last in violation of the injunction issued by Judge Barrett in the suit of Augustin Daly, claiming the exclusive right to produce the play in the United States and in Canada, both in English and German, has resulted rather disagreeably to the plaintiffs of the prohibition of the play.

Judge O'Brien yesterday imposed a fine of \$250 each upon Herman Schoenberg and Leo Winter, and thirty days imprisonment in jail, with the further order that the non-payment of the fines, or of an additional commitment to jail of thirty days. A fine of \$250 is imposed upon August Winter, but in this case the fine he is also to go to prison for thirty days.

Mr. Amberg being in Philadelphia since when an injunction proceedings were brought could not be served with the injunction order, and therefore could not be held liable for its violation.

They have a case, says Judge O'Brien, in his decision, "where persons with a full knowledge of the nature of the prohibition, and who in the absence of defendant (Gustav Amberg) were acting in the theatre, or performance of the play, acting in contemptuous defiance of the injunction, each in his own sphere, assisting in jail, with the further order that the non-payment of the fines, or of an additional commitment to jail of thirty days. A fine of \$250 is imposed upon August Winter, but in this case the fine he is also to go to prison for thirty days."

LIKELY TO FIND A NEW LOCATION.
Manager Miner and the Messrs. Gilley have not as yet come to an agreement about the rebuilding of the Fifth Avenue Theatre. Several conferences have been held, but how long before all the parties concerned will come to a complete understanding is much uncertain.

It is understood that Mr. Miner has the option on the property at the northeast corner of Broadway and Thirty-seventh street, and that he doesn't wish to come to an agreement with the representatives of the Gilley estate he will take up his option and build a large theatre on the property. The plan of the new theatre is to be a grand one, and to be managed by theatrical managers. It is said that Mr. Edgar Harrigan, Mr. Eugene Tompkins, of Boston, and Mr. Richard M. Hooley, of Chicago, are endeavoring to secure it at various times of the theatre site.

HAD TO OUT THE RACE SCENE.
For some reason or other the horse race scene in "The County Fair" at the Union Square Theatre did not work last night and had to be cut out of the play.

Immediately after the performance Mr. Burgess ordered a rehearsal of the scene to be given. The curtain went up before the audience had time to get out of the theatre, and as those still in the house turned toward the stage they saw Mr. Burgess in his riding costume, with a dog on his head, directing a number of stage hands. The scene was quite as funny as any in the play and there was much laughter.

As the people did not seem to care about going out Mr. Burgess had to step to the front of the stage and request the audience to leave.

HEARD AT THE THEATRES.
Stories of bad business on the road continue to reach the city. It was said yesterday that "The Will o' the Wisp" company, of which Mr. Edgar Eelden is the star, had received notice that its tour would come to an end this week.

A matinee will be given at the Madison Square Theatre to-day for the benefit of "The Little Mothers." The play to be given is "Ester Sandræ," and is by Mr. Sydney Grundy. Miss Amy Roselle is to play the principal part, and she will be supported by Mr. Arthur Dacre, Mr. Edward Bell, Mr. Merwyn Dallas, Mr. Sydney Booth, Mr. Fred Tyler, Mrs. E. J. Phillips, Miss Jennie Eustace and Miss Agnes Miller. "A Lost Thread," a dramatic dialogue, will also be given by Miss Roselle and Mr. Dacre.

"The Flying Dutchman" was repeated at the Metropolitan Opera House last evening before an exceedingly large audience. The opera was very well given, and the performance throughout was eminently satisfactory. Herr Fischer was again the Daland and Frau Mielke the Senta. Herr Reichner was the Flying Dutchman.

HOPKINSON SMITH'S WATER COLORS.
F. Hopkinson Smith has placed on exhibition at Avery's Galleries an interesting and attractive little collection of water colors of scenes at Constantinople and the East, painted during a trip from which he recently returned. The display will remain open until the 21st inst.

Mr. Smith, though a little more than in the detail might at times be desirable, has an capital idea of the picturesque. Drawn with pen and ink free touch and has an excellent command of color and atmosphere. His distances are particularly fine.

Among the best works are "The Vale de Mosque," "Entrance to Mosque, Scutari," "Early Morning—Lake Maggiore," "Rue de Constantinople," "The Old Town of Briga," "On the Normandy Coast—Caleau," "A Summer Morning in Venice," "The Landing at Bellagio" and "La Belle Mar."

ARRESTED AT THE CHARITY BALL.
Policeman McConnell, of the West Thirtieth street station, who was assigned to duty in citizen's clothes at the Charity Ball, arrested Otto Natchel, a waiter, for serving wine to a party of ladies and gentlemen after one o'clock. The waiter made no fuss but accompanied the policeman to the station house.

MUST PAY UP OR STOP.

ANOTHER JUDGE ON THE VERGE OF ENJOINING THE OPERATION OF THE "L."

Judge O'Brien in Supreme Court Chambers yesterday, in an opinion, condemned the methods adopted by the lawyers for the elevated railroad and threatened to enjoin the running of trains.

It was in the suit of Emily C. Watson to recover damages to her property, No. 243 Greenwich street, when her suit was tried several months ago before Judge Ingraham her counsel attempted to introduce evidence as to the fee damages, but as it was objected by the counsel for the elevated railroad it was rejected. The counsel for the railroad declined to put in any evidence as to the fee value, although Judge Ingraham said it was necessary.

In deciding the case, the judge said that the property of the fee could not estimate the damages and give a judgment for an absolute injunction against the road.

THE PUBLIC CONVENIENCE.
It is this injunction that the elevated railroad authorities seek to have stayed, and in deciding the motion for a stay the judge says:

In common with the other judges who have had these cases before them I recognize fully the wisdom of the injunction reached by the court in the case of the fee value of the property. It is a matter of public convenience that the property should be returned to the owner of the property for its lawful use, and having the right to use the property for its lawful use, the owner of the property should be able to use the property for its lawful use.

THE QUESTION, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

THE QUESTION, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

THE QUESTION, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

THE QUESTION, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

THE QUESTION, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

THE QUESTION, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

THE QUESTION, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

THE QUESTION, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

THE QUESTION, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

THE QUESTION, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

THE QUESTION, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

THE QUESTION, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use? The question, therefore, is, Shall the railroad, after having been enjoined from using the property for its lawful use, be able to use the property for its lawful use?

SHIPPING NEWS.

DATE OF DEPARTURE FROM NEW YORK.

terday, in an opinion, condemned the methods adopted by the lawyers for the elevated railroad and threatened to enjoin the running of trains.

It was in the suit of Emily C. Watson to recover damages to her property, No. 243 Greenwich street. When her suit was tried several months ago before Judge Ingraham her counsel attempted to introduce evidence as to the fees damages, but as it was objected by the counsel for the elevated railroad it was rejected. The court refused to allow the railroad to introduce evidence as to the fees damages, although Judge Ingraham said it was necessary.

In deciding the case the Judge said that because of this fact he could not estimate the damages and grant judgment for an absolute injunction against the road.